# The Gospel Herald.

"*Fear not; for behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to* all *people.*"

VOL. II. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, MAY 26, 1821. NO. 6.

## CIRCULAR LETTER.

"*The Elders and Messengers of the several Churches met in Association, in the City of New-York, October* 5, *A. D.* 1790.

(*Continued from p.* 3.)

Here we shall attend to three or four considerations.

1. That the Scripture is express against it.

2. That there are no Scriptures for it.

3. That there can be none, since it would be likely to do much hurt, but could do no good.

4. And lastly, that if the notion was in some degree likely to be true, yet that it would be safest to reject it.

The Scripture expressly says, that future punishment will be for ever. 2 Pet ii. 17. Jude 13. for ever and ever. Rev. xx. 10. 14. 11. 19. 3.

And we read of,—

Eternal damnation, Mark iii. 29.
Eternal Judgment, Heb. vi. 2.
Eternal Fire, Jude 7.
Everlasting Fire, Matt. xxv 41. 18. 8.
Everlasting Punishment, Matt. xxv. 46.

(*To be continued.*)

## REMARKS.

The declaration of this Association, that "The Scripture is express against it," and "that there are *no* Scriptures *for* it," is a most barefaced assertion. Did these Rev. Gentlemen ever read their Bibles attentively? We must conclude, that either they did not, or that they were so blind, they did not understand them, or that they wilfully misrepresented them. The *first* position we have obviated again and again. The *second*, we shall dispose of at once. Psa. lxxxvi. 9, 10. "All nations whom thou hast made *shall come and worship before thee*, O LORD; and shall *glorify thy name*. For thou art great, and doest wondrous things; thou art God alone." Let any person read this, to say nothing of *numerous* other passages, testifying to the same glorious truth, and then say, that "there is *no* Scriptures for it," at his peril! A man might as well deny the existence of matter itself.

The *third* position is puerile, weak, and contemptible—"That there can be *none*, (Why? Hear) since it would be *likely* to do much hurt, but could do no good!"

Their *fourth* position is, *what it is!* Reader, look at it ☞ "And lastly, that *if* the notion was in some degree *likely to be true*, yet it would be the *safest to reject it!*" We appeal to the reason of the reader,—Suppose a man were to tell you, "that it was in *some degree* likely to prove true," that *Napoleon Bonaparte*, and not Joshua, commanded the army of the Israelites at the taking of Jericho; would you not look sharply on him, to see whether he did not bear marks of his escape from a *mad-house?* We think you would. If any thing is *true*, it is true altogether; and if it is *false*, it is false altogether. The idea of a thing being in *some degree* likely to be true; and at the same time the safest course to reject it, involves the strange absurdity, that *falsehood* had better be believed than the *truth*; and on the principle too, of its being the *safest* course to pursue—to believe *falsehood* instead of *truth!!!*

The cluster of quotations, introduced by *wholesale*, have, we believe, been so frequently considered, that the patience of the reader would be exhausted, were we again to examine them separately. It is therefore sufficient to remark, that if the word *aionon*, in the original, means an endless duration, it means a much longer term of time than the apostles intended to express. It is a fact, that they used this word, *in common*, to express a *limited* time! Let him, who disputes this, appeal to the original, and prove the contrary, if he can. We, therefore, shall briefly remark upon the phraseology of the Rev. Gentlemen. They say, that "The Scripture expressly says, that *future* punishment shall be *for ever*." We are free to acknowledge, that these Gentlemen might have been unacquainted with the Scriptures, particularly the originals, and therefore are entitled to some excuse, which, had they been better informed, they could have no claims whatever. If by "*future* punishment," they meant punishment for sin in another world, &c. we declare, that they could produce no other evidence than their assertions to prove it. If by future punishment, they mean any suffering which is caused by sin, and which men may suffer posterior to the *present* moment, then there is no such thing as salvation for any one.

Their quotation from Mark iii. 29. is not to the purpose. The translation of this verse is *barbarous*. Mark is made to say, "He that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath *never* forgiveness, but is *in danger* of eternal damnation."—Now, according to this erroneous translation, a man may *never* be forgiven, and at the same time *never* be damned! He is only in *danger* of the damnation! The proper understanding of this is consistent, both with Scripture and common sense. Blasphemy is *speaking evil* of God. So long as a man speaks or thinks evil of God, (attributes *evil* purposes or intentions to God) he hath *not* (*ouk, not*—not *never*) forgiveness.

Their quotation from Heb. vi. 2. will, we think, surprise any reader who will examine the connex-

ion. The idea of a judgment which shall be endless, is of all ideas the wildest. *Third*, "Eternal fire, Jude 7." The reader is requested to turn to Ezek xvi. and read from the 44th verse to the end of the chapter. *Quere.* If the Sodomites are to suffer *endlessly* for an example, who are to be benefited *by* the example? *Fourth*, "Everlasting fire, Matt. xxv. 41. xviii. 8." The first we shall not say any thing about. The reader must already be satisfied, if any thing can satisfy him on this head. The quotation from Matt. xviii. 8. is qualified, even by pretenders to orthodoxy, in a manner which makes any particular comment on our part unnecessary. *Fifth*, Matt. xxv. 46. "Everlasting punishment." This is but a repetition of the former.

There are those who appear to delight in damnation and misery; but it is for their neighbours! The Scriptures are express, "The soul that sinneth it *shall* die." "The wages of sin is *death*." And the Scriptures are likewise express, "That as sin hath reigned *unto death*, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord." Now it must be evident to the meanest capacity, that if the death by sin is *endless misery*, it is impossible for grace ever to reign unto *life* by Christ.

(*To be continued.*)

---

FOR THE GOSPEL HERALD.

*Mr. Editor.*—As the two opposite unities of Almighty God and his Messenger the Messiah, are the most rational principles revealed in the Bible, the more impartially they are examined, the more reasonable they will appear.

My faith in the Scripture unities of Jesus Christ and his heavenly Father, who sent him, as two separate and unequal beings, is founded on your much esteemed and respectable preacher, Mr. Mitchell's *data*—(See in his late Sermon, page 1.) "Not in a blind acquiescence in things not understood, but in a rational conviction of the mind, grounded on evidence."

I wish to remind you, Mr. Editor, that, when I plead for making the language of the Bible my only rational rule in describing the two opposite unities of Jehovah and his servant Jesus, I do not found my opinions on the mere sound of words, or upon ambiguous, detached, and figurative passages, but copy my plan from the most natural, obvious, and only possible sense of Scripture. And when I read, that to Christians there is but one God, even the Father, who is a Spirit, and above all, and one Mediator between him and man, the Man Christ Jesus, whom God sent—it is impossible for language to describe two separate and unequal beings, if the Messiah, and that God who declares he sent him, are not two such intelligent agents.

The learned Moses Stuart, in his letters to Mr. Channing, contends, that they are not two distinct agents, but are *numerically* one and the same immutable and supreme character and infinite God. But his faith is not founded on "a rational conviction of the mind, grounded on evidence; but in a blind acquiescence in things not understood." And if all Mr. Stuart's writings were as unscriptural and irrational as his definition of the unity of his God, the public would then have reason to exclaim, "Much learning hath made thee mad:" for no rational intelligence, in the proper exercise of his reason, could possibly avow, that a subordinate and finite person and character, and a supreme and infinite God—the one Jehovah, and his servant and messenger, the mediator whom he sent, are numerically one and the same immutable character and infinite God. And when Mr. S. pleads for invoking a subordinate character as supreme God, his reason is dormant.

When Christians believe that there is but one infinite God, who alone is the Almighty Creator and gracious Father of all, who claims the exclusive, supreme adoration of his numerous family, they are declared in Scripture to do well; and for them to imitate Jesus Christ in worshipping his heavenly Father as their only God, is a scriptural and reasonable service; but for them to invoke any other name, person, or character, as supreme Jehovah, is altogether unscriptural and irrational.

Reason is that most excellent gift of our Maker to man, which exalts him above the brute creation, and renders him a moral and accountable agent, capable of virtue and vice, praise and blame, rewards and punishments. And as Christ's divine standard, of worshipping the person of his heavenly Father alone, who is a Spirit, in spirit and in truth, is the only rational mode of adoring our Sovereign Maker, Christians are bound to abandon the invocation of all other names, persons, and characters, as unreasonable.

Some have exclaimed against all reasoning concerning the unity of Almighty God, as they supposed that reason was an enemy to real religion. But reason is never an enemy to any man in his opinions, until himself has become an avowed enemy to right reason. And as the Bible unity of the person and perfections of our heavenly Father is perfectly rational, none can abandon his unity as erroneous, but those who are avowed enemies to reason and revelation.

There are two extremes that Christians have fallen into respecting their reason in establishing the unity of their sovereign Maker. One is, that they have made no use of their reason in reading the Scripture account of unity; and the other extreme is, exalting their own reasoning as divine truth, before the plain language of the Bible. As there is not a single passage within the sacred Book wherein it is declared, that the Messiah and that Infinite Being who affirms he sent him, are one God, all who advocate that sentiment have only inferential reasoning for their foundation; and thus they exalt their own depraved human reason as divine law, above plain revelation; and abandon the

Bible unity of the person of the Almighty Father, to establish the invocation of their human trinity.

They likewise go to another extreme, of making no use of their reason in reading their Bibles. When they read, "To us there is but one God, even the Father, who is a Spirit, and above all, and that all true worshippers worship the Father; and one Mediator, a messenger between God and man, the man Christ Jesus;" and conclude, that they both are numerically one and the same supreme and infinite God—they certainly make no use of their reason in forming their conclusions. Their faith is "not a rational conviction of the mind, grounded on evidence; but a blind acquiescence in things not understood;" and as contrary to reason and Scripture, as light is opposed to darkness.

(*To be continued.*)

---

(The disposition, so general in the world, to "put out of the synagogue" all who may think differently from ourselves, and to prefer claims to exclusive holiness, is, in the following apologue, satirized in a manner which, in our opinion, will have a greater effect than a cold argument, or common reproof and animadversion.)

*The Coffee-House of Surat, an Oriental Apologue; from Etudes de la Nature, par M. de St. Pierre.*

In the city of Surat was a coffee-house, to which persons of various countries resorted. One day a Persian Seider, or Doctor of the Law, entered the room. This man had employed his whole life in theological discussions, and yet believed no longer in the existence of a Deity. "What is God?" said he, "Whence does he come? From whom does he derive his origin? In what part of the universe does he exist? If he were a corporeal being, we should see him; if a spiritual existence, he would be intelligent and just, and would not permit his rational creatures to be unhappy. I, for instance, after having been so much devoted to his service, should have been the high priest at Ispahan, instead of being compelled to abandon Persia, after having endeavoured to enlighten my countrymen. It is evident then, that there is no God." Thus was the Doctor bewildered by his ambition. By perpetually reasoning on the first cause of all things, he had, at last, actually lost his understanding; insomuch, that he took it into his head, that it was not his own reason of which he was deprived, but that the intelligence by which the universe is governed no longer existed.

This Doctor had a slave, a Caffre, almost naked, whom he left at the door of the coffee-house. He himself sat down on a sofa, and took a cup of opium. When this potion had begun to operate on his brain, he thus addressed his slave, who was sitting on a stone in the sunshine, and busy in driving away the flies that tormented him: "Thou wretched Negro, dost thou believe there is a God?"—"Who can doubt it?" answered the slave; and instantly taking a little wooden monkey from the ragged piece of cotton that covered his waist, "Here," said he, "is the God who has protected me ever since I was born. It is made of a branch of the fetiche tree* that grows in my country."—The company in the coffee-room were not less astonished at the answer of the slave than at the question of the master.

"Thou poor idiot," said a Bramin, shrugging his shoulders, "What! dost thou carry thy God in thy girdle? Know that there is no other God than Brama, who created the world, and whose temples are on the banks of the Ganges. The Bramins only are his priests; and it is by his particular protection that they have been preserved 120,000 years, amid all the revolutions in India." Here he was interrupted by a Jewish courtier, who asked, "How can the Bramins believe that God has no temples but in India, and that he exists for their cast only? There is no other God than the God of Abraham, and he has no people but the people of Israel. He still preserves them, although dispersed over the whole earth; and he will continue to preserve them till that happy period, when he is to restore Jerusalem to them, give them dominion over all nations, and re-establish their temple, once the wonder of the world."—In uttering these words, the Israelite shed some tears. He was proceeding, when an Italian, in a blue robe, angrily said, "You give a very injurious representation of God, in asserting that the Israelites only are the objects of his favour. He rejected them seventeen hundred years ago; which is evident from their present dispersion. He now invites all men into the pale of the church of Rome, out of which there is no salvation."—A Protestant minister, of the Danish mission at Tranquebar, changing countenance, here addressed the Catholic priest: "How can you thus exclude all from salvation but the members of your idolatrous communion? Learn, that none can be saved, but those who, as the disciples of Jesus, and in conformity to his gospel, worship God in spirit and in truth." Then a Turk, a custom-house officer at Surat, who was smoking his pipe, said to the two Christians, with a very grave countenance, "Fathers, why do you confine the knowledge of God to your churches? The law of Jesus has been abolished ever since the divine mission of Mahomet, the Comforter foretold by that very Jesus, the Word of God. Your religion exists in a few kingdoms only; our has been erected on its ruins in the finest countries of Europe, Africa, Asia, and the Isles. It is now seated on the throne of the Great Mogul, and has penetrated even into China, that country of knowledge. You perceive, yourselves,

* Fetiche is a name given in Africa to the Divinities of the country, one of whom is supposed to preside over a whole province, and one over every family. This idol is made of a particular tree, on which is carved the head of an ape, a bird, or any such thing, as fancy may suggest.

the reprobation of the Jews, in their present humiliation: behold the mission of the prophet in his victories. None can be saved but the friends of Mahomet and Omar; for as to the disciples of Ali, they are infidels."—At these words the Seider, who was a native of Persia, where the people are universally of the sect of Ali, affected to smile. But this theological conversation, among persons of such different nations and religions, produced a great quarrel, for, besides those already mentioned, there were Abyssinian Christians, Cophts, Tartarian Lamas, Arabian Ishmaelites, and Guebres or Worshippers of Fire. These were all disputing on the nature of God and of the worship due to him; each insisting, that the only true religion was that of his own country.

In the coffee-room was a learned Chinese, a disciple of Confucius, who was travelling for the acquisition of knowledge. He sat, drinking tea in a corner of the room, attending in silence to the dispute. The Turkish custom-house officer accosting this Chinese with great vehemence, said, "My good silent Chinese, you know that many religions have found their way into China. The merchants of your country, who have had occasion for my services, have in fact told me so, in assuring me, that of all these religions, that of Mahomet is the best. Be as ingenuous and just as they have been. What is your opinion of God and the religion of our prophet?"—There was now a universal silence. The disciple of Confucius, concealing his hands in his long sleeves, and placing them cross-wise on his breast, paused for some moments, and then addressed the company in a mild and deliberate voice: "Gentlemen, if you permit me to speak my opinion with frankness, I must observe, that ambition is universally the cause of the disagreements among mankind. I will relate an instance of this, which is still fresh in my memory.

"When I left China, I went on board an English ship, which had been round the world. In our voyage to this place, we came to anchor on the eastern coast of Sumatra. At noon, having landed with many of the crew, we sat down under some cocoa-trees, between a small village and the sea-shore. Under the shade of these trees, many persons, of different countries, were reposing. To this spot came a blind man, who had lost his sight by contemplating the sun. He had the foolish ambition of understanding the nature of that great luminary, with the selfish view of appropriating its glorious light to himself. He had tried all the methods of optics, chymistry, and even of magic, in order to inclose one of its rays in a bottle. All his efforts being unsuccessful, he gravely said, 'The light of the sun is not a fluid; for it cannot be agitated by the wind. It is not a solid; for it is impossible to separate a single particle from it. It consists not of fire; for it is not to be extinguished in water. It is not a spirit; for it is visible. It is not a body; for it cannot be felt. It has not even a locomotive power; for it does not agitate the lightest bodies. It is evidently, therefore, a nonentity.'—In fine, this philosopher, by incessantly contemplating the sun, and reasoning upon its light, had lost his eyes, and what is worse, his understanding. He imagined, not that his sight was lost, but that the sun no longer existed. His conductor was a Negro, who, having seated his master under a cocoa-tree, took up one of its nuts from the ground, and began to make a lamp of its shell, a wick of its rough filaments, and to extract from its kernel a little oil for his lamp. While the Negro was thus employed, the blind man, sighing, said to him, 'There is no longer then any light in the world?'—'There is the light of the sun,' answered the Negro. 'What is the sun?' replied the blind man. 'I know no more of it,' returned the slave, 'than that its rising is the beginning of my labour, and its setting the end of it. The light of the sun is of less consequence to me than that of my lamp, which enlightens my cottage, and without which I could not serve you in the night.'—Then taking up his lamp, 'This,' said he, 'is *my* sun.' At this conversation, one of the villagers, who walked with crutches, began to laugh; and supposing that the blind man had been born so, he said to him, 'Know that the sun is a globe of fire, which rises every day in the sea, and sets each evening in the west, in the mountains of Sumatra. This you would see as well as all of us, if you had the enjoyment of sight.' A fisherman then said, 'It is very evident that you have never been out of your village. If you had legs, and were to make the tour of the island of Sumatra, you would find that the sun does not set in these mountains, but that it leaves the sea every morning, and returns to it in the evening to refresh itself. I constantly see this myself, on whatever part of the coast I may be fishing.' An inhabitant of the Peninsula of India then said to the fisherman, 'Is it possible that any man endued with common sense, can imagine the sun to be a globe of fire, that it leaves the sea every day, and returns in the evening to be extinguished? You are to know then, that the sun is a divinity of my country, who traverses the heavens every day in his chariot, making a circuit round the golden mountains of Merouwa; and when he is eclipsed, he is swallowed up by the serpents *Ragou* and *Kelou*, from which he is delivered by the prayers of the Indians on the banks of the Ganges. It is a very ridiculous pride in an inhabitant of Sumatra, to suppose that the sun shines only on the horizon of this island. Such an idea could never enter into the head of any man who had navigated any thing larger than a canoe.' A Lascar, the master of a coasting vessel then at anchor, here observed, that it was still a more ridiculous pride to believe that the sun preferred India to every other country. 'I have made several voyages,' he continued, 'in the Red Sea, on the coast of Arabia, to Madagascar, and to the Molucca and Philippine Islands; and I know that

the sun illumines all these countries as well as India. He makes no circuit round a mountain; but he rises in the isles of Japan, which, on that account, are called *Jepon* or *Ge-pu-en*, which signifies the birth of the sun: and he sets far to the west, behind the British Isles. I am certain of this, for I was told so, when a boy, by my grandfather, who had sailed to the very extremities of the ocean.' He was proceeding, when one of our crew interrupted him: 'There is not a country,' said he, 'in which the course of the sun is better known than in England. I can inform you then, that it rises and sets nowhere. It constantly makes the circuit of the earth. I am very certain of this; for we are just returned from a circuit round the globe, and we met the sun every where.' Then taking a stick from one of his auditors, he traced a circle on the sand, and endeavoured to shew the course of the sun from tropic to tropic; but being unable to explain himself, he appealed to the pilot of his own ship for the truth of his assertion. This pilot was a sensible man, who had attended in silence to the dispute; but when he saw that the whole company were attentively waiting for his opinion, he thus addressed them: 'My friends, you are mutually deceiving each other. The sun does not turn round the earth; on the contrary, the earth turns round the sun, presenting to it, every twenty-four hours, the Isles of Japan, the Moluccas, Sumatra, Africa, Europe, and many other countries. It does not shine for a single mountain only, for an island, a horizon, an ocean, or even for the whole earth; but it is in the centre of the universe, whence it enlightens, not only the earth, but five other planets, some of which are much larger than the earth itself, and at a far greater distance from the sun. Such, for instance is the planet Saturn, 30,000 leagues in diameter, and distant from the sun 285 millions of leagues; not to mention their attendant moons, which reflect the solar light to the most distant planets. You would each have an idea of these sublime truths, were you to take a nocturnal view of the heavens; and if you did not foster the silly pride of believing, that the sun was made for a single country only.' Thus spoke, to the great astonishment of his auditors, the pilot who had made a voyage round the world, and attentively observed the heavens.

"It is the same," added the disciple of Confucius, "with God as with the sun. Every man believes that he exclusively possesses the Deity, in his own chapel, or, at least, in his own country. All nations imagine, that in their respective temples, they enclose that glorious Being whom the visible universe cannot contain. But is there a temple comparable to that which God himself has erected, to collect all men, as it were, in one communion? All the temples of the earth are but imitations of the universal temple of Nature. In the greatest part of them we find places for absolution and vases of holy water, columns, cupolas, lamps, statues, inscriptions, books of the law, sacrifices, altars, and priests. But in what temple is there a sacred vessel so capacious as the sea, which is not contained in a shell? Columns so noble as those of the trees of the forest, or of the orchards loaded with fruit? A cupola so sublime as the firmament, or a lamp so resplendent as the sun? Where can we behold statues so interesting as a number of rational beings, who mutually love, and aid, and hold converse with each other? Inscriptions more intelligible, or more devout, than the bounties of Nature? A book of the law so universal as the love of God, resulting from a grateful sense of his goodness; or as the love of our fellow-creatures, so intimately connected with our own welfare? Sacrifices more affecting than hymns of praise to the Universal Parent and Benefactor of all; or than the tender sensations with which we regard those, with whom it is our duty to participate in all the blessings of existence? In a word, an altar so sacred as the heart of the good man, of which God himself is the Priest? Thus, the more exalted the ideas which man entertains of the omnipotence of God, the better will he become acquainted with him; and the greater the degree of indulgence with which he treats his brethren of mankind, the more will he imitate his goodness. Let not him then, who enjoys the light of the Deity diffused through the universe, despise the superstitious man, who perceives only a small ray of it in an idol, nor even the atheist who is totally deprived of it; lest, as a punishment of his pride, he meet with the fate of this philosopher, who, wishing to engross to himself the light of the sun, became blind, and was reduced to submit to the guidance of a poor Negro and his lamp."

Thus spoke the disciple of Confucius; and the whole company in the coffee-house, who had been disputing concerning the excellence of their respective religions, now mused in silence on what had fallen from his lips.

## EDWARDS *against* CHAUNCEY.

"*For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be.*" Matt. xxiv. 27.

A young lady, suspected of favouring Universalism, recently received from a Rev. believer in *endless misery*, the loan of Dr. Edwards's *famous* book, written against the doctrines of the late Dr. Chauncey of Boston, Mass. This, or something like it, has for some time been the practice of Clergymen. They consider, or at least they *pretend* to, that Dr. Edwards ripped the doctrine of Universal Salvation from its foundation; and scattered the arguments of its supporters to the four winds of heaven. Now we declare, that Dr. Chauncey was *not* a Universalist, if by Universalism is meant a belief in the salvation of all men *in Christ*. We consider both of these opponents as armed with *error*, and beating the air. Although

it would be worse than useless to regret that Dr. Edwards is not now living to defend his book, we shall regret exceedingly the want of *courage* and candour in his admirers, if they do not come forward and defend this book, which they by their praises have adopted for their own. Relative to the doctrine advocated by Dr. Chauncey, let it be remembered, that we *neither believe nor advocate it!* Therefore, these Rev. Gentlemen who wield this book as a weapon against our faith, will find themselves in a similar situation with those, who should introduce the ancient weapons and discipline, and contend with them against the modern tactics and artillery. Dr. Chauncey's opinions, therefore, can be sold, or given away, without exciting our fear or anxiety.

Truth is progressing. Like the progress of the natural light, which first appears but faintly emerging through the clouds of night, and gently chaces away the mists and shadows in its dawn, so the *truth*, glimmering through the mists of error, rises, until the full meridian glory bursts upon the astonished beholder, and error for ever disappears. Dr. Chauncey, if you please, beheld but the *dawn*. And Dr. Edwards lived and died in the *moonshine of Calvinism!*

Passing by Dr. Chauncey and his opinions altogether, we shall notice a few of the *brilliant traits* in the doctrine and opinions of Dr. Edwards, and leave the whole to the consideration of the reader, and the *particular* attention of all those, who consider Dr. E.'s book as almost a *divine* collection of *truisms!*

Dr. E. in Chap. vi. p. 119. after having said a great deal about the *curse of the law*, remarks—"the consequence is inevitable, that it is *endless misery*." In page 120, reasoning syllogistically, he says, "If it then be an established point, that endless misery *is* the curse of the divine law; the inference is immediate and NECESSARY—that the endless misery of the *sinner* is a *just punishment of his sin*." Now, we shall take the liberty to follow the track which the Doctor has beaten in his wisdom; and if it lands in ridiculous absurdity, we trust that his *admirers* will be just, and generous too, and give *him* all the credit of it.

"*If*," says the Doctor—Reader, what follows? This, and this alone; If, (as the Dr. preached) Christ suffered the *curse of the law*, in the room and stead of *some* sinners, (the elect *few*) then "the inference is immediate and NECESSARY," that he suffered "*endless misery!!!*" If you dispute this, you dispute the Dr.'s premisses. If Christ did not, or will not, suffer "*endless misery*," it "follows of necessity," either that endless misery is *not* the curse of the law, or that Christ did not *endure* the curse of the law. Reader, if you deny these conclusions you deny the infallibility of Dr. E. and admit that he was most egregiously mistaken. But this is not all. The *ignorance*,—yes, we repeat it, the *gross* ignorance of this celebrated Doctor in Divinity, is here notoriously manifested! The Scriptures declare of Christ, that his name "should be called Jesus, (Saviour) for he should save his people from their *sins*." Dr. E.'s Saviour was to save sinners from the *just punishment* due them *for* their *sins*. Again, This Doctor in Divinity was ignorant of the definition of the word *curse*. And his numerous admirers, are as ignorant as he was! At the fall of Adam, the *ground* was *cursed*. Reader, do you think the *ground* was made *endlessly miserable?* But to settle this question, it is only necessary to let the Scriptures speak for themselves. An apostle asks the question, "Wherefore then the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come, to whom the promise was made. *Is* the law then against the promises of God? God forbid." Gal. iii. Christ is the Seed; and the promise, that *all* the families of the earth should be blessed in Christ, was made to Abraham 430 years *before* the law; and the apostle declares of this promise, which he calls a covenant, that it was *confirmed* before of God *in* Christ; and that the law *cannot* disannul it, and make it of none effect. Dr. E., however, will have it, either that the law *can* destroy the promises of God, or that the promise was made only to a *part*. Heaven in mercy deliver the world from such teachers.

This Rev. Doctor, in the estimation of the public, was possessed of very great natural and acquired abilities; and eminently qualified to subserve the cause of truth. It may, in the opinion of some, appear like presumption in us, to question his pretensions. But we do it. Truth, and truth alone, which of all things is most desirable, is our only inducement; and we *boldly* point out errors, and in the face of the world, *challenge* all his advocates and admirers to prove them to be *truth*.

We shall now examine the Doctor's arguments to prove that only a *part* of mankind are interested in the atonement of Christ. In his xith chap. pp. 203, 204, the Doctor has attempted to reason away the testimony contained in Col. i. 20. The words *eis auton*, translated *unto himself*, the Dr. makes the ground of his attack. He remarks: "In the preceding verse, we have *en auton;* in the 20th verse we have *di autou, staurou autou*, and again, *di autou*. Now it seems very odd, (says he) that in this multiplied use of *autos*, in its various cases, one instance only should be selected from the rest, and rendered *himself*, meaning the Father, and in all the other instances it should be referred to Christ. No person, without prepossession, construing this passage, would render it in that manner. It is altogether unnatural to suppose, but that *autos* refers to the *same* person in all these instances, and ought to be rendered accordingly. It is further to be observed concerning *apokatallato* and *katallasso*, that in all instances in which they occur in the New Testament, in the Septuagint, and in the Apocrypha, the person to whom the subject of the proposition is said to be

reconciled, is never once expressed in the accusative case governed by the preposition *eis*; but is always expressed in the dative case. Hence it may be infered that *eis auton* in Col. i .20. does not mean the person *to* whom all things in heaven and earth are reconciled; but that it means, that *all* things in heaven and earth *are* reconciled to *each other*, into him: i. e. so as to be brought *into Christ*, to be united under him as their head, and be interested in the common advantages and blessings of *his* glorious kingdom. By sin, angels and men, Jews and Gentiles, became alienated from each other; and men in general, by the predominancy of self-love, became virtually *enemies* to each other. Now it pleased the Father to *reconcile* by Jesus Christ, *angels* and *men*, Jews and Gentiles *to* each other, and to diffuse by his grace a spirit of benevolence among them, whereby they should *love their neighbour as themselves.* Now, we say, admit this, and what follows? Ans. The passage in Col. i. 20. has nothing to do with the reconciliation of God in Christ, or the Bible of all books ever heard of, is the most *contradictory.* Paul declares, 2 Cor. v. 19, that "God *was* in Christ reconciling the world unto himself," &c. But Dr. E. will have it, that this reconciliation is not unto God; but unto *each other!* Let the admirers of this Rev. Dr come forward and defend this book. We tell them, that here is a passage in point. They shall be accommodated with the Doctor's own premisses; in this passage *Katallasson* is not expressed in the accusative case governed by the preposition *eis.* Now, what will you do with it? Will you contend that Paul meant that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto the world; and no other sense is contained in the passage? This you cannot do, on the Doctor's premisses. It therefore follows, that according to the Dr. the passage in Col. i. 20. and 2 Cor. v. 19. mean different things! If this is not admitted, what will you do? But the Dr. says, (in a note at the bottom of the page) "whether this criticism on the words *eis auton*, be *just* or not, it affects not the main question of the salvation of all men." The reader will expect a reason for this: here it is—"But if we once admit a *limitation*, and some doubtless will insist, that it extends to angels, and to believers only from among men: as it is said, that *all* Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, were baptized by John; *all* men counted John that he was a prophet: *all* men came to Christ, John iii. 26. But if we should allow that *all* things in heaven and earth include all mankind; still even in this extent it is true, that it pleased the Father to reconcile all things; but in such a sense, as *not* to imply the *salvation of all* men." Now we think the Dr. fell into the very pit which he digged for others! His own premisses shall furnish the conclusion. He has acknowledged, that even the reconciliation mentioned in Col. i. 20, means, that "God would diffuse by his grace a spirit of benevolence among them, whereby, they should *love* their neighbour as *themselves.*" Will he pretend that those shall be endlessly miserable who *love* their neighbour as themselves? "Love is the fulfilling of the law." Dr. E. continues—"This is true in the same sense, in which God hath no pleasure in the death of the wicked, Ezek. xxxiii. 11," &c. Every one *must* admit, that both are true. Now we understand the Dr. this way; that as God had no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but was willing he should live, if he *could*; so he is willing that *all* men should be reconciled that will *reconcile themselves!* Reader, what do you think of this? When the apostle declared, "and having *made peace* (it is done! How? ☞) by the *blood of his cross*, (what for? Ans.) by him to reconcile *all* things unto himself," &c. Do you believe that he meant to convey only this idea, that God was willing this should (in the future tense) be done? Does not this passage speak of Christ as acting? or does it merely convey the idea, that God is passive, and is simply on the whole, willing, if the sinner is pleased to be willing too, that he should *reconcile himself.* The Dr. continues—"It is true in the same sense in which God was *unwilling* to give up *Ephraim.* Hosea xi, 8." The Dr. has here admitted premisses, which destroy, in a moment, all his fine spun reasoning. The reader is requested to turn to the passage, and read from the xi. chap. and 8th verse, to the xiii. 14. "I *will ransom* them from the power of the grave; *I will redeem* them from death: O death, *I will* be thy plagues; O grave, I *will be* thy destruction: repentance shall be hid from my eyes." (I will never turn from this purpose.) Now, we say, that it is impossible to put words together which will express in stronger terms an inflexible determination to effect a purpose, than the above; or to express more clearly what that purpose is. Reader, God was *unwilling*, or, if you please, it was not *his* purpose to destroy Ephraim; but it *was*, emphatically, his purpose to redeem him *from* destruction. To prove this beyond the possibility of refutation, we read at the 9th verse, "O Israel *thou* hast destroyed *thyself;* but in *me is* thine help." We pity the man whose prejudice shall so far get the upper hand of his reason, as to induce him to *pervert* this passage, which for plainness of phraseology, and strength of expression, will challenge competition with any, and every thing which can be produced. The Dr. continues—"In the same sense in which Christ was unwilling to give up the inhabitants of Jerusalem," &c. The 39th verse of the chapter (Matt. xxiii.) from which this quotation is made, upsets, at once, the Doctor's argument. "For I say unto you, ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say, blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." Comment here would be superfluous! The Dr. continues—"As the good parent who, to *prevent* that punishment to which his disobedient and apostate child must,

going on in his disobedience, be subjected, uses all proper means to reclaim him, may be said to be *pleased* with the idea of his impunity; so the Deity, who uses all proper means to reclaim *all* mankind, and to reconcile them to one another, may be said to be *well pleased* with the *idea* of this reconciliation, or to choose to reconcile all men to one another, and to bring them into Christ. In *itself* it is the *object* of his choice and complacency." Reader, this is the reasoning of a man, who pretended to believe that God *foreknew* every thing which could, or should take place. And he, notwithstanding this, talks of the Deity's being *well pleased* with the idea of an event which will *never* take place, and which he knew would *never* happen at the time when he was so *well pleased* with it. To make the absurdity the more glaring, the Dr. adds, "in *itself* it is the *object* of his *choice*," &c. The Deity was so *well pleased* with this *idea*, that he made it the *object* of his *choice*, knowing, that what he was so well pleased with, and chose, &c. should *never* happen! "In this sense," says the Dr. "it pleased the Father to reconcile *all* things,—it was what *pleased* him." That is, in *no sense at all!* Reader, this *logic* came from the pen of a celebrated Doctor of (or *in*, we do not understand this matter) *divinity*. Had it come from an *idiot*, or the lunatic hospital, it would have excited less surprise.—The poor Dr. was hard pushed; and in quoting Col. i. 21—23, *omitted* the words, "*in the body of his flesh through death*;" and supplied their place with a ——! And this abominable perversion has passed without comment, although 146 clergymen's names are published in the list of subscribers at the end of the volume, and deacons too numerous to mention!

*(To be continued.)*

---

"*An answer to the question, Why do you go to the Unitarian Church?*"

Under the above head, recently appeared a *Tract*, &c. from which we make the following selection: "Because Unitarians teach the doctrine of the 'true grace of God,'—his *unmerited, unpurchased* favour to mankind.—that salvation and eternal life are his *free gifts* through Jesus Christ; which is clearly the doctrine of the Scriptures, &c.

☞ Because there a *future* righteous retribution is preached, that every man shall be judged according to what he hath, and not according to what he hath not; that our *future* condition is not determined by an arbitrary and irresistible decree, *but according to the deeds done in the body.*"

"Because the gospel, as preached by Unitarians, is on a level with the *common* sense of mankind," &c.

Reader, is the above on a level with *your* sense? Can you conceive of "salvation, as being the unmerited, *free gift* of God," and at the same time man be *judged* according "to the deeds done *in the body?*"

*From the London Universalist's Miscellany.*

## THE LOVE OF GOD.

Will heaven's King for ever frown,
For ever pour his vengeance down,
Upon the creatures he has made,
For whom he hath the ransom paid?

Whilst happy spirits sing above,
The wonders of the Saviour's love,
Shall others, doom'd to endless pain,
For ever sigh, yet sigh in vain?

If so, how shall the Saviour see
The travail of his soul, and be
For ever satisfied, if they
Shall never rise to endless day?

If so, how must the kind design
And energy of Love Divine
To save mankind, be overthrown,
If damned souls for ever moan?

Were not all things to Jesus given,
Both things on earth, and things in heav'n,
When first he undertook the plan,
To save the fallen race of man?

What pleasure can to God arise,
Or to the blest above the skies,
To see in endless pain consign'd,
So great a part of human kind?

Can boundless mercy cease to flow,
Whilst on the burning plains below
His creatures groan beneath their pain,
And never visit them again?

Then there can no proportion be
Between their sin and misery.
For finite crimes, infinite pains,
The thought Jehovah's honour stains.

If all things new created be,
Then all things old shall pass away.
Thus does the word of promise run,
When all shall be in Christ made one.

If grace shall more than sin abound,
Where then shall misery be found?
It cannot be while one remains
Devoted unto endless pains.

That all mankind in Adam died;
This is a truth by few denied.
That all in Jesus Christ shall live;
This is a truth but few believe.

Yet nothing is more plain reveal'd,
And by Almighty promise seal'd;
That all shall in his image shine,
And in his praises all combine.

---

☞ *Correspondents* S**** *and* Mentor *are received.*

---

*EDITED BY HENRY FITZ.*
PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT $2 50 PER ANN.
PAYABLE IN ADVANCE.
HOYT & BOLMORE, PRINTERS, 70 BOWERY.